



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

110  
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

| APPLICATION NO.                           | FILING DATE   | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.  | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|---------------|----------------------|----------------------|------------------|
| 10/020,055                                | 12/07/2001    | Antonio Colmenarez   | US010546             | 7472             |
| 24737                                     | 7590          | 09/07/2007           | EXAMINER             |                  |
| PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS |               |                      | WILLIAMS, LAWRENCE B |                  |
| P.O. BOX 3001                             |               |                      | ART UNIT             | PAPER NUMBER     |
| BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510                |               |                      | 2611                 |                  |
| MAIL DATE                                 | DELIVERY MODE |                      |                      |                  |
| 09/07/2007                                | PAPER         |                      |                      |                  |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

|                              |                        |                     |  |
|------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|--|
| <b>Office Action Summary</b> | <b>Application No.</b> | <b>Applicant(s)</b> |  |
|                              | 10/020,055             | COLMENAREZ ET AL.   |  |
|                              | <b>Examiner</b>        | <b>Art Unit</b>     |  |
|                              | Lawrence B. Williams   | 2611                |  |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on Remarks filed on 21 June 2007.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) 6 is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-5 and 7-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 19-22 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)          | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### *Response to Arguments*

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-22 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-2, 7, 10-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bullock et al. (2002/0049036 A1) in view of Kite (US Patent 6,792,263 B1) and further in view of Tiedemann, Jr. et al. (US Patent 5,802,105)

(1) With regard to claim 1, Bullock et al. discloses in Fig. 1, a system for a cordless modem comprising: a base station (102) comprising means (111) for connection with a communication line (col. 5, lines 26-29); a remote unit (106-109) for connection with an interface of a modem (element 107 shows a modem, as is a modem inherent in element 108, the fax machine); at least one booster station (element 105; Bullock et al. discloses the extension unit amplifying the data signals from elements 106-109; pg. 3, paragraph 0074); said base station including means (103; through interface 112) for wireless communication with said remote unit; said remote unit comprising means (104) for wireless communication with at least said base

Art Unit: 2611

station. Bullock et al. teaches the use of antenna 104 for use of transmitting from each of elements 106-109 to the base station 102. Bullock et al. does not however disclose the base station including means for testing using wireless communication between the base station and remote unit and selecting a frequency providing a strongest reception from a plurality of available channels.

However Kite teaches an automatic scanning and adjusting ability for both a remote and answering machine (base) to adjust over multiple channels or frequencies to a best reception frequency or clearest frequency (col. 11, lines 29 –50; col. 17, lines 33-39). Though Kite does not explicitly specify “means for testing”, means for testing would be obvious, since Kite teaches an automatic scanning and adjusting ability for both the remote and answering machine (base) to adjust over multiple channels or frequencies to a best reception frequency or clearest frequency.

One skilled in the art would clearly recognize that some means of testing the channels during scanning and adjusting would be obvious to determine a best reception channel/frequency.

However, Tiedemann, Jr. et al. teaches in Fig(s). 2A, 2B, a base station (Fig. 1, element 12) including means for testing (Fig. 2A, elements 33, 34; Fig. 2B, elements 48, 49, 50, 52) a plurality of channels using wireless communications (Fig(s), 2A, 2B, discloses antennae 34, 41, respectively) between the base station and a remote unit (Fig. 1, elements 16, 18) (abstract).

It would have obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to incorporate the teachings of Tiedemann, Jr. et al. as a method of method of determining transmission and reception performance across the channels.

Art Unit: 2611

(2) With regard to claim 2, Tiedemann, Jr. et al. also discloses wherein the means for testing includes means for comparing levels of test patterns (Fig. 2B, element 49) communicated between said base station and said remote station. Tiedemann, Jr. discloses detecting CRC and bit error levels of the test patterns (col. 5, line 64-col. 6, line 6, col. 6, lines 13-24; col. 9, lines 50-56).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to compare levels of the test patterns as an assessment of channel accuracy.

(3) With regard to claim 7, claim 7 inherits all limitations of claim 1, above. As noted above, Bullock et al. in combination with Kite and Tiedemann, Jr. et al. disclose all limitations of claim 1 above. They do not however explicitly teach the remote unit is arranged in the case of a portable computer. However, Bullock et al. does teach the remote comprising a computer modem (107). One skilled in the art would know that computer modems inside laptops (portable computers) are well known in the art and it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to place the remote unit (modem) in the case of a portable computer to enable the same internet accessibility provided to the stationary computer.

(4) With regard to claim 10, though neither of the inventors disclose a remote unit including an antenna arranged on the case of a portable computer so that it is oriented upward when the computer is open, lap tops and other electronic communication devices with antennae and antennae design in general are well known in the art and an antenna arranged on the case of a portable computer so that it is oriented upward when the computer is open would be a mere design choice of one skilled in the art.

Art Unit: 2611

(5) With regard to claim 11, claim 11 discloses the method of the system disclosed in claim 1. Therefore a similar rejection applies.

(6) With regard to claim 12, claim 12 inherits all limitations of claim 11 above. As noted, Bullock et al. in combination with Kite and Tiedemann, Jr. et al. disclose all limitations of claim 11. Furthermore, Tiedemann, Jr. et al. also discloses wherein step (d) comprises generating a test pattern (col. 11, VI. Data Packet Generation) for transmission between said base station and said remote unit. In this passage Tiedemann, Jr. et al. discloses generation of the test pattern/sequence and testing of reverse and forward link channels between a mobile unit (remote) and a cell-site (base station).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to incorporate the teachings of Tiedemann, Jr. et al. as a method as a method of determining transmission and reception qualities of the channels.

4. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bullock et al. (2002/0049036 A1) in combination with Kite (US Patent 6,792,263 B1) and Tiedemann, Jr. et al. (US Patent 5,802,105) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Ito et al. (US Patent 6,690,915 B1).

As noted above, the combination of Bullock et al. Kite and Tiedemann, Jr. et al. disclose all limitations of claim 1, above. They do not however teach the system according to claim 1, further comprising at least one booster station in wireless communication with said base station and said remote unit, said at least one booster station including receiving means for

Art Unit: 2611

receiving information transmitted from said base station and said remote unit and transmitting means for transmitting information to said base station and said remote unit.

However, systems comprising a booster station in wireless communications with a base station and a remote are well known in the art as verified by Ito et al. Ito et al. teaches in Fig. 1, a system comprising at least one booster station (100) in wireless communication with a base station (180, 182) and remote unit (132), said at least one booster station including receiving means (118) for receiving information transmitted from said base station and said remote unit and transmitting (120) means for transmitting information to said base station and said remote unit.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to incorporate the teachings of Ito et al. as a known method of amplifying the signal, to increase the range of transmission/reception thereby enhancing the transmission/reception quality of the transferred signal.

(3) With regard to claim 8, claim 8 inherits all limitations of claim 3, above. Bullock et al. teaches the remote comprising a computer modem (107). One skilled in the art would know that computer modems inside laptops (portable computers) are well known in the art and it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to place the remote unit (modem) in the case of a portable computer to enable the same internet accessibility provided to the stationary computer.

5. Claims 4, 5, 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bullock et al. (2002/0049036 A1) in view of the combination of Kite (US Patent 6,792,263 B1) and

Art Unit: 2611

Tiedemann, Jr. et al. (US Patent 5,802,105) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Bullock et al. (US Patent 6,778,817 B1).

(1) With regard to claim 4, claim 4 inherits all limitations of claim 1 above. As noted above, the combination of Bullock et al., Kite and Tiedemann, Jr. et al. disclose all limitations of claim 1. They do not disclose wherein said base station includes means for connection with a first electrical outlet, and said system further comprises at least one booster station being in wireless communication with said remote unit, said booster station including means for connection with a second electrical outlet (105, 307), and said base station and said at least one booster station including means for communication over a common electrical wiring system between said first and second electrical outlets.

However, Bullock et al. 6,778,817 B1 teaches a method and system for combining wireless phone jack and RF wireless communications wherein he discloses in Fig(s) 2, 3, a base station (104) includes means for connection with a first electrical outlet (105), and said system further comprises at least one booster station (106) being in wireless communication with a remote unit (109), said booster station including means for connection with a second electrical outlet (105, 307), and said base station and said at least one booster station including means for communication over a common electrical wiring system between said first and second electrical outlets (col. 4, lines 30-57).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of Bullock et al. as a method of providing a telephone communication system for the communication of signals using A/C power lines and wireless RF signals (col. 2, line 61 - col. 3, line 12).

(2) With regard to claim 5, Bullock et al. 6,778,817 B1 teaches that in certain cases the power lines could supply reliable communications and thus the use of the signal booster and RF antenna would not be needed. Though Bullock et al. does teach the method of determining the most reliable communication method, one skilled in the art could readily adapt the method for use in the booster as taught by Berger et al. as applied to the base station to ascertain the more reliable method of communications between the devices.

(3) With regard to claim 9, claim 9 inherits all limitations of claim 5, above. Though neither of the cited references explicitly teach the remote unit is arranged in the case of a portable computer, Bullock et al. does teach the remote comprising a computer modem (107). One skilled in the art would know that computer modems inside laptops (portable computers) are well known in the art and it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to place the remote unit (modem) in the case of a portable computer to enable the same internet accessibility provided to the stationary computer.

6. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bullock et al. (2002/0049036 A1) in view of the combination of Kite (US Patent 6,792,263 B1) and Tiedemann, Jr. et al. (US Patent 5,802,105) as applied to claim 11 above, and further in view of Ito et al. (US Patent 6,690,915 B1).

As noted above, the combination of Bullock et al., Kite and Tiedemann, Jr. et al. disclose all limitations of claim 11, above. They do not however teach the method according to claim 11, further comprising providing at least one booster station in wireless communication

Art Unit: 2611

with said base station and said remote unit, said at least one booster station receiving an re-transmitting communications between said base station and said remote unit.

However, systems comprising a booster station in wireless communications with a base station and a remote are well known in the art as verified by Ito et al. Ito et al. teaches in Fig. 1, a method comprising providing at least one booster station (100) in wireless communication with a base station (180, 182) and remote unit (132), said at least one booster station receiving (118) and retransmitting communications between said base station and said remote unit (col. 1, lines 11-16).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to incorporate the teachings of Ito et al. as a known method of amplifying the signal, to increase the range of transmission/reception thereby enhancing the transmission/reception quality of the transferred signal.

7. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bullock et al. (2002/0049036 A1) in view of the combination of Kite (US Patent 6,792,263 B1) and Tiedemann, Jr. et al. (US Patent 5,802,105) as applied to claim 11 above, and further in view of Ito et al. (US Patent 6,690,915 B1).

As noted above, the combination of Bullock et al., Kite and Tiedemann, Jr. et al. disclose all limitations of claim 12, above. They do not however teach the method according to claim 12, further comprising providing at least one booster station in wireless communication with said base station and said remote unit, said at least one booster station receiving an re-transmitting communications between said base station and said remote unit.

Art Unit: 2611

However, systems comprising a booster station in wireless communications with a base station and a remote are well known in the art as verified by Ito et al. Ito et al. teaches in Fig. 1, a method comprising providing at least one booster station (100) in wireless communication with a base station (180, 182) and remote unit (132), said at least one booster station receiving (118) and retransmitting communications between said base station and said remote unit (col. 1, lines 11-16).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to incorporate the teachings of Ito et al. as a known method of amplifying the signal, to increase the range of transmission/reception thereby enhancing the transmission/reception quality of the transferred signal.

8. Claims 15, 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bullock et al. (2002/0049036 A1) in view of the combination of Kite (US Patent 6,792,263 B1) and Tiedemann, Jr. et al. (US Patent 5,802,105) as applied to claim 11 above, and further in view of Bullock et al. (US 6,778,817 B1).

(1) With regard to claim 15, as noted above, the combination of Bullock et al., Kite and Tiedemann, Jr. et al. disclose all limitations of claim 11. They do not however disclose, wherein step (a) includes providing a connection for said base station to an electrical outlet of an electrical system; and step (g) includes providing the at least one booster station with a connection to another electrical outlet of said electrical system; and (h) providing means for said base station and the at least one booster station to communicate over the electrical wiring system.

Art Unit: 2611

However, Bullock et al. (US 6,778,817 B1) discloses in Fig(s) 2, 3, wherein step (a) includes providing a connection (105) for said base station (104) to an electrical outlet of an electrical system; and step (g) includes providing the at least one booster station (106) with a connection to another electrical outlet (105, 307), of said electrical system; and (h) providing means (Fig. 3) for said base station and the at least one booster station to communicate over the electrical wiring system (col. 4, lines 30-57).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of Bullock et al. as a method of providing a telephone communication system for the communication of signals using A/C power lines and wireless RF signals (col. 2, line 61 - col. 3, line 12).

(2) With regard to claim 17, Kite teaches an automatic scanning and adjusting ability for both a remote and answering machine (base) to adjust over multiple channels or frequencies to a best (strongest) reception frequency or clearest frequency (col. 11, lines 29 –50; col. 17, lines 33-39). Though Kite does not explicitly specify “testing”, testing would be obvious, since Kite teaches an automatic scanning and adjusting ability for both the remote and answering machine (base) to adjust over multiple channels or frequencies to a best reception frequency or clearest frequency.

One skilled in the art would clearly recognize that some means of testing the channels during scanning and adjusting would be obvious to determine a best reception channel/frequency.

However, Tiedemann, Jr. et al. teaches in Fig(s). 2A, 2B, a method of testing frequency channels comprising, a base station (Fig. 1, element 12) including means for testing (Fig. 2A,

Art Unit: 2611

elements 33, 34; Fig. 2B, elements 48, 49, 50, 52) a plurality of channels using wireless communications (Fig(s), 2A, 2B, discloses antennae 34, 41, respectively) between the base station and a remote unit (Fig. 1, elements 16, 18) (abstract).

It would have obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to incorporate the teachings of Tiedemann, Jr. et al. as a method of method of determining transmission and reception performance across the channels.

9. Claims 16, 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bullock et al. (2002/0049036 A1) in combination with Kite (US Patent 6,792,263 B1) and Tiedemann, Jr. et al. (US Patent 5,802,105) as applied to claim 12 above, and further in view of Bullock et al. (US 6,778,817 B1).

As noted above, the combination of Bullock et al., Kite and Tiedemann, Jr. et al. disclose all limitations of claim 12. They do not however disclose, wherein step (a) includes providing a connection for said base station to an electrical outlet of an electrical system; and step (g) includes providing the at least one booster station with a connection to another electrical outlet of said electrical system; and (h) providing means for said base station and the at least one booster station to communicate over the electrical wiring system.

However, Bullock et al. (US 6,778,817 B1) discloses in Fig(s) 2, 3, wherein step (a) includes providing a connection (105) for said base station (104) to an electrical outlet of an electrical system; and step (g) includes providing the at least one booster station (106) with a connection to another electrical outlet (105, 307), of said electrical system; and (h) providing

Art Unit: 2611

means (Fig. 3) for said base station and the at least one booster station to communicate over the electrical wiring system (col. 4, lines 30-57).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of Bullock et al. as a method of providing a telephone communication system for the communication of signals using A/C power lines and wireless RF signals (col. 2, line 61 - col. 3, line 12).

(2) With regard to claim 18, Kite teaches an automatic scanning and adjusting ability for both a remote and answering machine (base) to adjust over multiple channels or frequencies to a best (strongest) reception frequency or clearest frequency (col. 11, lines 29 -50; col. 17, lines 33-39). Though Kite does not explicitly specify "testing", testing would be obvious, since Kite teaches an automatic scanning and adjusting ability for both the remote and answering machine (base) to adjust over multiple channels or frequencies to a best reception frequency or clearest frequency.

One skilled in the art would clearly recognize that some means of testing the channels during scanning and adjusting would be obvious to determine a best reception channel/frequency.

However, Tiedemann, Jr. et al. teaches in Fig(s). 2A, 2B, a method of testing frequency channels comprising, a base station (Fig. 1, element 12) including means for testing (Fig. 2A, elements 33, 34; Fig. 2B, elements 48, 49, 50, 52) a plurality of channels using wireless communications (Fig(s), 2A, 2B, discloses antennae 34, 41, respectively) between the base station and a remote unit (Fig. 1, elements 16, 18) (abstract).

It would have obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to incorporate the teachings of Tiedemann, Jr. et al. as a method of method of determining transmission and reception performance across the channels.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

10. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

11. Claims 1-2, 11-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kite (US Patent 6,792,263 B1) in view of Tiedemann, Jr. et al. (US Patent 5,802,105).

(1) With regard to claim 2, Kite discloses in Fig(s). 5A, 17, a system for a cordless modem comprising: a base station (Fig. 17, element 404, answering machine) comprising means for connection with a communication line (telephone line 406); a remote unit (5A) for connection with an interface of a modem (285); said base station including means for wireless communication with said remote unit (antenna 416, col. 9, lines 30-35); said remote unit comprising means for wireless communication with at least said base station (antenna, col. 13, lines 59-63); said base station including means for testing using wireless communication between said base station and said remote unit and selecting a channel providing a strongest reception from a plurality of available channels for wireless communication between said base station and said remote unit (col. 11, lines 29 –50; col. 17, lines 33-39). Though Kite does not use the phrase “means for testing”, means for testing would be obvious, since Kite teaches an

Art Unit: 2611

automatic scanning and adjusting ability for both the remote and answering machine (base) to adjust over multiple channels or frequencies to a best reception frequency or clearest frequency. One skilled in the art would clearly recognize that some means of testing the channels during scanning and adjusting would be obvious to determine a best reception channel/frequency.

However, Tiedemann, Jr. et al. teaches in Fig(s). 2A, 2B, a base station (Fig. 1, element 12) including means for testing (Fig. 2A, elements 33,34; Fig. 2B, elements 48, 49, 50, 52) a plurality of channels using wireless communications (Fig(s), 2A, 2B, disclose antennae 34, 41, respectively) between the base station and a remote unit (Fig. 1, elements 16, 18) (abstract). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to incorporate the teachings of Tiedemann, Jr. et al. as a method of method of determining transmission and reception performance across the channels.

(2) With regard to claim 2, Tiedemann, Jr. et al. also discloses wherein the means for testing includes means for comparing levels of test patterns (Fig. 2B, element 49) communicated between said base station and said remote station. Tiedemann, Jr. discloses detecting CRC and bit error levels of the test patterns (col. 5, line 64-col. 6, line 6, col. 6, lines 13-24; col. 9, lines 50-56).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to compare levels of the test patterns as an assessment of channel accuracy.

(3) With regard to claim 11, claim 11 discloses the method of the system disclosed in claim 1. Therefore a similar rejection applies.

(4) With regard to claim 12, claim 12 inherits all limitations of claim 11 above. As noted, the combination of Kite and Tiedemann, Jr. et al. disclose all limitations of claim 11.

Art Unit: 2611

Furthermore, Tiedemann, Jr. et al. also discloses wherein step (d) comprises generating a test pattern (col. 11, VI. Data Packet Generation) for transmission between said base station and said remote unit. In this passage Tiedemann, Jr. et al. discloses generation of the test pattern/sequence and testing of reverse and forward link channels between a mobile unit (remote) and a cell-site (base station).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to incorporate the teachings of Tiedemann, Jr. et al. as a method as a method of determining transmission and reception qualities of the channels.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

12. Claim 6 is allowed.

13. Claims 19-22 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

***Conclusion***

14. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- a.) Kite discloses in US Patent 6,104,923 Remote Operational Screener.
- b.) Bartholomew et al. discloses in US Patent 5,911,119 Secure Cordless Telephone Extension System And Method.

c.) Beesley discloses in US Patent 5,680,538 Telecommunications system Having Single Base Unit And Plural Individual Antennas Each For Communication With One Or More Remote Handsets For Use Within Premises.

d.) Nakamura discloses in US Patent 5,943,617 Radio Channel Test System For Mobile Telecommunication System With Test Terminals In Radio Service Zones Of Radio Base Stations.

e.) Yuasa discloses in US 2001/0008391 A1 Transmitting Device, Receiving Device, And Receiving Method.

f.) Giorgi et al. discloses in US Patent 5,802,446 Method And Apparatus For Testing A Communication Channel.

15. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lawrence B Williams whose telephone number is 571-272-3037. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (8:00-6:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ghayour Mohammad can be reached on 571-272-3021. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Lawrence B. Williams

lbw  
September 4, 2007

055  
Application/Control Number: 10/020,005

Art Unit: 2611

19  
Page 20

Lawrence B. Williams

  
lbw

August 29, 2007

  
MOHAMMED GHAYOUR  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER